

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 THOUGHT, INC.,
8 Plaintiff,

9 v.
10

ORACLE CORPORATION, et al.,
11 Defendants.

Case No. [12-cv-05601-WHO](#) (WHO)

**ORDER RE MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION OR
RECONSIDERATION**

Re: Dkt. No. 54

12 Currently before the Court is Oracle's motion for clarification or reconsideration of the
13 Court's October 10, 2013 Order Limiting Claims (Docket No. 50). The Court is inclined to
14 GRANT the motion for clarification and to clarify that "a prior art instrumentality (such as a
15 device or process) and associated references that describe that instrumentality shall count
16 as one reference, as shall the closely related work of a single prior artist."

17 To date, plaintiff has not responded to Oracle's motion. If Thought wishes to comment on
18 that motion or the Court's current intention, Thought shall file a response of no more than five (5)
19 pages on or before Wednesday November 20, 2013.

21 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

22 Dated: November 14, 2013

23 
24 WILLIAM H. ORRICK
United States District Judge